arXiv:1207.0887v2 [gr-qc] 18 Jul 2012

Energy on black hole spacetimes

Alejandro Corichi[1, 2, *]

[1]Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
UNAM-Campus Morelia, A. Postal 61-3, Morelia, Michoacán 58090, Mexico
[2]Center for Fundamental Theory, Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos,
Pennsylvania State University, University Park PA 16802, USA

We consider the issue of defining energy for test particles on a background black hole spacetime. We revisit the different notions of energy as defined by different observers. The existence of a time-like isometry allows for the notion of a total conserved energy to be well defined, and subsequently the notion of a gravitational potential energy is also meaningful. We then consider the situation in which the test particle is adsorbed by the black hole, and analyze the energetics in detail. In particular, we show that the notion of horizon energy es defined by the isolated horizons formalism provides a satisfactory notion of energy compatible with the particle's conserved energy. As another example, we comment a recent proposal to define energy of the black hole as seen by an observer at rest. This account is intended to be pedagogical and is aimed at the level of and as a complement to the standard textbooks on the subject.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q, 04.70.-s, 04.70.Bw

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of energy in general relativity is rather subtle. The notion that a conserved quantity with the interpretation of energy must be conserved disappears once it is realized that in general relativity there is no "absolute" background on which the theory is defined. Instead, the geometry becomes a dynamical variable. As a consequence, the notion of a gravitational energy density becomes ill defined. Still, there are solutions to the equations of motion that are stationary, in the sense that there is a notion of time invariance. It is then natural to expect that in those situations, there will be conserved quantities associated to the motion of matter fields. That is indeed the case with the so called Komar quantities, constructed out of the Killing vector fields and the stress energy tensor of matter. Down in the ladder of complexity, one might ask about the existence of a conserved quantity for test particles moving on stationary spacetimes. Such a quantity has been known for a long time, but its interpretation as a total energy of the particle is not always found in the introductory treatment of the subject.

One of the purposes of this manuscript is to review and revisit this conserved quantity and compare it to other notions of energy that have their origin in the special theory of relativity. As we shall show, the conserved quantity can indeed be interpreted as a total energy, that also *contains information about the gravitational field*. Thus, in certain circumstances, one can indeed define the notion of a gravitational potential energy satisfying a set of desired properties. The next question pertains to the case of the exterior of a black hole where the spacetime is stationary and for which the horizon represents a boundary. We analyze in detail the behavior of these quantities in the vicinity of the black hole. It is then natural to consider the case when the particle falls into the back hole. Is there a notion of energy associated to the black hole that can capture the intuitive idea that energy should *not* be lost? Can one keep track of the energy of the in-falling object as being gained by the black hole? As we shall see, the answer is in the affirmative. The natural notion of energy within the isolated horizon formalism satisfies these properties. One can also achieve consistency with the energy balance at infinity, for asymptotically flat spacetimes, provided we associate to the test particle the total (conserved) energy.

Still one might want to consider different notions of energy, such as the one associated to an observer at rest outside the black hole. What would then be the new notion of energy associated to the black hole in order to keep the energy balance? Again, the isolated horizons formalism allows us to consider this possibility and yields a modified notion of black hole energy. As we shall show, this energy approaches asymptotically the horizon area for large black holes but has some nontrivial dependence in general. We briefly comment on this choice as has been recently advocated in the literature.

The structure of this note is as follows. In Sec. II we pose the problem to be considered, namely the energy of test particles on stationary spacetimes. Sec. III specializes to the case of a static Schwarzschild black hole. In Sec. IV we consider the case where the particle falls into the black hole and how this affects the energy of the black hole. This will depend on the notion of energy for the horizon. We consider two cases, namely the standard choice within the isolated horizons formalism and a new proposal to describe the situation from the perspective of an observer at rest outside the horizon. We end with a discussion in Sec. V.

Throughout the manuscript we use the 'natural' units

---

[*] Electronic address: corichi@matmor.unam.mx

for general relativity, namely geometrical units where G=c=1, and we adopt the abstract index notation as in [1].

Disclaimer: It should be noted that in this manuscript there are very few 'new results'. Our aim has been to collect well known results in a coherent manner when dealing with the notion of energy for test particles and their interaction with black holes. Experts must be warned that they might not find anything 'new' so, should they continue reading, it will have to be at their own risk.

II. ENERGY ON STATIONARY SPACETIMES

Let us start by considering an asymptotically flat spacetime (M, g) with a time-like Killing vector field ξ^a, such that, in the (space-like) asymptotic region $\xi_a \xi^a = -1$. Thus, ξ approaches the four-velocity of an inertial observer at infinity, and can also be interpreted as generator of asymptotic time translations. The existence of the generator of time isometries on the background space-time implies that there are some conserved quantities. In ordinary 'Newtonian' dynamics, time invariance implies conservation of energy, and the situation is no different in general relativity. Here we shall focus on test particles with a four-velocity u^a. The corresponding four momentum is $p^a = m u^a$, with m the *rest mass* of the object (defined by $m^2 := -p_a p^a$). The quantity that is conserved, if the test particle is on free-fall is given by,

$$\mathcal{E} = -m\, \xi_a\, u^a \tag{1}$$

(The proof is rather direct: $u^b \nabla_b \mathcal{E} = -m(u^b u^a \nabla_b \xi_a + u^a \xi^a \nabla_b u^a) = 0$. The first term vanishes because ξ is a KVF and satisfies the Killing equation $\nabla_{(a}\xi_{b)} = 0$. The second term is equal to zero since u^a satisfies the geodesic equation $u^a \nabla_a u^b = 0$.) What is the physical interpretation of the quantity $\mathcal{E}$? Can we say it corresponds to the energy of the particle? The energy as measured by whom? Before answering these questions, let us recall what is the notion of energy in special relativity. In that case one possesses a family of preferred *global* inertial observers. Their corresponding four velocities ξ_o *are* Killing vector fields, that are also normalized $\xi_{oa}\, \xi_o^a = -1$. If we have a particle with four-momentum p^a, not necessarily following a geodesic, then the energy of the particle, as measured by the observer ξ_o is given by,

$$E = -\xi_{oa}\, p^a \tag{2}$$

This is the standard expression used in the standard textbooks. If one introduces inertial coordinates such that $\xi_o^a = (\partial/\partial T)^a$, then $E = p_0$, the 'time component' of the four vector. This quantity is also helpful to measure the *speed* of the particle as measured by ξ_o. we have that,

$$E = m\, \gamma \tag{3}$$

where $m^2 = -p_a p^a$ and $\gamma = 1/(\sqrt{1 - v^2})$. Then, it is straightforward to see that E is the relativistic generalization of the *Kinetic energy.* If the object is at rest with respect to the inertial observer, then $E = m$, the rest mass. If the object moves with a small velocity $v \ll 1$ (recall that we are setting $c = 1$) then,

$$E \approx m \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} v^2\right) = m + \frac{1}{2} m v^2$$

That is, E represents the total energy of the particle as measured by the inertial observer, that in the small velocity regime is given by the rest energy plus the Newtonian kinetic energy. Let us denote the quantity E as the *generalized kinetic energy* (GKE) of the particle. Clearly, E is conserved if the particle follows a geodesic, namely if it travels at constant speed with respect to the inertial observer ξ_o.

Can we generalize the energy E to general relativity? The answer is simple: Yes. The difference is that now, we do not have global inertial observers, so one has to instead consider *locally inertial observers.* Thus, at a point p of the space-time M, a local observer w^a, such that $w_a w^a = -1$, will measure the energy of a particle with four-momentum p^a to be,

$$E = -w_a\, p^a \tag{4}$$

The interpretation is clear. The observer w^a should be thought of as being instantly at rest, and the quantity E is the energy of the moving object as measured by that instantly inertial observer. This quantity can always be defined for any observer and any particle, without any restriction on the background space-time nor the dynamics followed by the observer or the test object. The problem with this quantity is that it gives us no information about the gravitational field. It can not, since one is constructing it by exploiting the fact that locally any point on space-time 'behaves' as if it were in special relativity. Thus, the equivalence principle forbids us to draw any information about the gravitational field from this quantity. What one effectively is doing is to go to an instantaneous inertial reference frame where the gravitational field 'disappears', to measure the energy of the moving object.

Let us now return to the quantity $\mathcal{E}$ defined for stationary spacetimes. Can it represent the energy as measured by some observer? The answer is indeed in the affirmative. Let us now see how that comes about. Suppose that the test object starts 'at rest' at spatial infinity, then the observer at infinity that follows the word-lines of the KVF ξ will measure the energy of the particle to be $E = -p_a \xi^a$. But notice that this is precisely the conserved quantity $\mathcal{E}$. Then, this quantity corresponds to the generalized kinetic energy as measured by an observer at rest at infinity. But, can we assign to it a further interpretation that 'knows' about the gravitational field? That is, can one define a notion of *gravitational potential energy* and relate it to $\mathcal{E}$? In order to answer that question, let us briefly recall the notion of gravitational potential energy in Newtonian theory. For simplicity, consider the case of a central object of mass M. The force on an object of mass m at a distance r is Mm/r^2 (recall that $G = c = 1$). Thus, the gravitational potential energy is given by $U = -Mm/r + C$ with C a constant. The standard choice is to take $C = 0$ such that $U(r = \infty) = 0$. The total, conserved, energy of the particle is then,

$$E_{\rm Tot} = {\rm KE} + U = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - \frac{Mm}{r} + C' \tag{5}$$

with C' a constant. Again, the standard choice is to take $C' = 0$ but, in order to make contact with general relativity, one can very well take $C' = m$. With this choice, the total Newtonian energy of a particle, at rest at infinity is $E_{\rm Tot} = m$. Obviously, the conserved quantity in the Newtonian theory has a contribution from the gravitational field. It is then natural to assume that in the general relativistic setting, if there is a conserved quantity representing energy of the particle, it should contain information about the gravitational field. Thus, the object $\mathcal{E}$ is the natural quantity to represent the *total energy* of the particle. And, from our previous discussion, it should have information about the (stationary) gravitational field.

Let us then define $\mathcal{E}$ as the total energy of the particle and study some of its properties. The first thing to notice is that there is a simple relation with the generalized kinetic energy which comes from the normalization of the KVF ξ^a. The four-velocity w^a of an observer that follows the word-lines of the KVF ξ is given by,

$$w^a = \frac{\xi^a}{V}$$

with $V^2 = |\xi_a \xi^a|$, the so-called 'redshift factor'. With this, we have

$$\mathcal{E} = -p_a \xi^a = -V\, p_a w^a = VE \tag{6}$$

Note that one can formally define a GR-generalization of the potential energy by setting $\mathcal{E} := E + \mathcal{U}$. Thus, the quantity $\mathcal{U}$ becomes,

$$\mathcal{U} = E\,(V - 1) \tag{7}$$

Or, alternatively, $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{E}(1 - 1/V)$. With this choice, a particle that is at rest at infinity has a total energy of $\mathcal{E} = m$ equal to the GKE E. Thus, in that case the generalized potential energy at infinite vanishes, as in the Newtonian case. For the quantity $\mathcal{U}$ to capture the intuitive notion of a *negative*, gravitational potential energy, then the norm of the KVF should satisfy $V < 1$. Note also that, if the particle is moving when it reaches infinity, then $\mathcal{E} > m$. If $\mathcal{E} < m$ then the object can not reach infinity and is therefore, bounded. A particular case of this situation is when the particle is at rest with respect to the observer following the orbits of ξ^a. In this case, the four-momentum is $p_a = m w_a$, and the corresponding energies are: $E_{\rm res} = m$, of course, and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rm res} = -m\xi^a w_a = -mVw^a w_a = mV\,.$$

The potential energy becomes then,

$$\mathcal{U}_{\rm res} = m(V - 1)$$

Let us now consider the particular case of interest, namely when the spacetime corresponds to the exterior of an eternal black hole.

III. ENERGY ON THE VICINITY OF A BLACK HOLE

For simplicity, the spacetime we are going to consider is given by the Schwarzschild metric,

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)\mathrm{d}t^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1}\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 \tag{8}$$

From this expression we see that the KVF is $\xi^a = (\partial/\partial t)^a$, with norm given by,

$$V = |\xi_a \xi^a|^{1/2} = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{1/2}$$

Recall that this spacetime is asymptotically flat, and has a horizon at $r_{\rm h} = 2M$, where M is the ADM mass of the spacetime and one can also associate it to the mass of the black hole (more about this later). Note that $V < 1$ and $V \to 0$ as one approaches the horizon. Let us now see what values take several of the quantities we have defined. First, let us write the relation between the GKE E, as measured by an observer at rest with respect to the BH at a 'distance' r, and the total energy $\mathcal{E}$,

$$E = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{1/2}} \tag{9}$$

From here we can use the relation $E = m\gamma$ to find the speed of the particle with total energy $\mathcal{E}$, as measured by the observer at rest at a 'distance' r,

$$v = \left[1 - \frac{m}{\mathcal{E}}\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{1/2}. \tag{10}$$

From (9) one can see that, for a particle with given energy $\mathcal{E}$, the GKE as measured by observers at rest will increase and diverge as one approaches the horizon. Eq. (10) is the generalization of the Newtonian equation relating speed with the total energy and distance from the origin. Let us see what information we can extract from it. First, suppose the particle has an energy $\mathcal{E} > m$, then it can reach infinity and there, the speed is given by $v|_\infty = \sqrt{1 - m/\mathcal{E}}$. If the total energy is less than the rest mass, $\mathcal{E} < m$ then the particle can not reach infinity. For instance if it is 'thrown' upward and then follows a radial geodesic, then the maximal radial distance it will attain is,

$$r_{max} = \frac{2M}{1 - \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}}{m}\right)^2} \tag{11}$$

before falling again in the direction of the black hole.

Accelerated motion at rest. Let us consider the following situation. We start with a test particle of rest mass m following the orbit of the KVF ξ^a at infinity. The total energy is clearly $\mathcal{E} = m$. Now, let us assume that we lower the particle in a quasi-static fashion in such a way that it is at rest at a distance r. We know that in the Newtonian theory, the energy of the particle decreases, since it only possesses potential energy. We expect that in general relativity the total energy $\mathcal{E}$ also decreases. In fact, from Eq. (II) we see that the total energy is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{res} = m\sqrt{1 - \frac{2M}{r}} \tag{12}$$

There are two points to remark. As expected, the energy decreases as r decreases but as the particle approaches the horizon, the total energy approaches zero. That is, a particle that is held by an observer at rest just outside the black hole horizon has an energy $E = m$, as measured by the observer, but its total energy is much smaller, approaching zero at the horizon. That is, it has lost all its energy due to the negative gravitational energy given by,

$$\mathcal{U}_{\rm res} = m\left[\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{1/2} - 1\right] . \tag{13}$$

The second observation is that this potential energy satisfies several desired properties. i) For $r \gg 2M$, the quantity approaches $\mathcal{U}_{\rm res} \approx -Mm/r$. ii) It is always negative, and iii) It serves as a potential for the force felt by the test particle to be held at rest. The magnitude of the force is $f = mg$ with g the norm of the acceleration $\alpha^b = u^a\nabla_a u^b$. That is, $g = \sqrt{-\alpha_b\alpha^b}$. In our case,

$$f = \frac{mM}{r^2}\,\frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{1/2}} = \partial_r\,\mathcal{U}_{\rm res} \tag{14}$$

Note that potential energy $\mathcal{U}_{res}$ improves on the proposal put forward in [2].

Circular motion. Let us now consider the test particle of rest mass m following a stable circular orbit. When there is angular momentum, the radial coordinate satisfies a potential equation of the form,

$$({\rm d}r/{\rm d}\tau)^2 + V(r) = (\mathcal{E}/m)^2 - 1\,,$$

with $V(r) = -2m/r + L^2/(m^2r^2) - 2ML^2/(m^3r^3)$. Circular orbits are determined by the extrema of the potential. It has two extrema, one maximum and one local minimum, that represents stable circular orbits. The smallest such orbit is when both extrema coincide, which occurs when $L^2 = 12M^2m^2$. Then, the value of this minimum radius r_c^- is equal to $r_c^- = 6M = 3r_{\rm h}$. If one evaluate the potential $V(r)$ for this value, one finds that,

$$\mathcal{E}_c = m\sqrt{\frac{8}{9}} = m\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \tag{15}$$

Thus, we see that, if we now consider a test particle that is on circular orbit 'at infinity' for which $\mathcal{E} = m$, and then the particle looses energy by following quasi-circular orbits, it will, at most, loose an energy equal to $m(1 - 2\sqrt{2}/3)$, before plunging into the black hole. This is clearly the energy source of accretion disks around black holes, that loose energy by radiating in the electromagnetic spectrum. One can also find the speed of the particle on the last stable circular orbit to be, $v_c = \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)^{1/2}$, which is close to 36% of the speed of light. Clearly, most of the results described here will be qualitatively similar for other asymptotically flat static black holes.

So far, we have considered test particles in a static black hole background and studied the different types of energy one can consider for the particle. What we have not considered is what happens when the particle crosses the horizon and falls into the black hole. That will be the subject of the next section.

IV. ENERGY OF THE BLACK HOLE

In this section we shall consider the issue of the energy of the particle and how it relates to the energy of the black hole. In the previous section we considered only test particles, where the test object does not affect the background black hole. In this section we shall relax that assumption a bit. We will still neglect any back-reaction on the background geometry as long as the particle remains outside the horizon, but shall consider the change in area and mass of the black hole as the objects fall into the horizon.

Let us start by the simplest case, namely an object of rest mass m at rest at infinity in the spacetime of a black hole of mass M. Here, the total energy of the spacetime, as captured by the ADM mass is then $M_{ADM} = M + m$. We are assuming that $m \ll M$ and therefore, there is little 'interaction' between the black hole and the object. Here, the mass M of the black hole, refers to the horizon mass $M_{\rm h}$ as defined by the *isolated horizon* formalism [3].

Let us now assume that we drop the object radially towards the BH, following a radial geodesic. Then the total energy of the particle is $\mathcal{E} = m$, and that quantity shall be conserved along the geodesic. The object will cross the horizon at a finite proper time (assuming we did not actually drop it from infinity but rather from a sufficiently distant asymptotic region). The horizon will react to the crossing of the object and will quickly settle down to a new isolated horizon. The question now is: what is the new horizon mass $M_{\rm h}'$? To answer that question is rather simple. After the object falls into the black hole and it settles, to the future the spacetime will be vacuum and approximately static (in our approximation we are assuming the energy radiated is negligible with respect to m), so it is very well approximated by a Schwarzschild metric with mass $M_{\rm h}'$. In the isolated horizon formalism it has been established that for static spacetimes with an isolated horizon, as is our case, the ADM mass and the horizon mass coincide (More generally, when there is radiation, the Bondi energy at future null infinity and the 'mass at i^+', coincide [3]). That is, the new horizon mass will simply be,

$$M'_{\rm h} = M_{\rm h} + \mathcal{E} \tag{16}$$

which means that the change in horizon mass is equal to the total energy of the test object, $\delta M_{\rm h} = \mathcal{E}$. The next scenario is to consider a particle that has a total energy smaller that its rest mass, $\mathcal{E} < m$. This could be the case, if initially the test object is at rest at some distance from the black hole and is then released to fall into the black hole following a radial geodesic. Just as in the previous case, the horizon mass $M_{\rm h}$ of the black hole will change by an amount equal to the total energy of the test object $\mathcal{E}$,

$$\delta M_{\rm h} = m\sqrt{1 - \frac{2M}{r_{res}}}\,, \tag{17}$$

where r_{res} is the distance from which the object is released. The extreme case is when the object of mass m is held at rest just outside the horizon. As we saw in the previous section, the total energy of the object can be arbitrarily small, so when released into the black hole, the change in mass will be arbitrarily small.

Let us now recall the first law of black hole mechanics. For the non-rotating case we are considering, there is a relation between the change of mass of the black hole and how much it 'grows' as measured by a change in area. The relation is given by,

$$\delta M_{\rm h} = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi}\,\delta A_{\rm h} \tag{18}$$

where κ is the so-called surface gravity and $A_{\rm h}$ is the horizon area $A_{\rm h} = 4\pi r_{\rm h}^2$. The surface gravity can be found from the equation $\ell^a\nabla_a\ell^b = \kappa\ell^b$ with ℓ the null generator of the isolated horizon. For static spacetimes it is standard to set $\ell^a = \xi^a$ but, in principle, other choices are allowed. What the Eq. (18) is telling us is that the horizon mass can only be a function of the area A (or radius r, of course). Thus κ could be in principle an arbitrary function of $r_{\rm h}$. For the Schwarzschild spacetime we have that $\kappa_o(r_{\rm h}) = 1/(2r_{\rm h})$, from which one can integrate the first law to obtain [3],

$$M_{\rm h}(r_{\rm h}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{r_{\rm h}} \beta(r)\,{\rm d}r \tag{19}$$

with $\beta(r) = 2r\,\kappa(r)$. This formula is valid for any non-rotating static horizon. Note that, for the standard choice κ_o, $\beta_o = 1$, from which we obtain a horizon mass $M_{\rm h}(r_{\rm h}) = r_{\rm h}/2$. Note also that when integrating the 1st law, one is setting $M_{\rm h}(r_{\rm h})|_{r_{\rm h}=0} = 0$.

From our previous discussion regarding energetics, we see that the standard choice for surface gravity leading to an equality between horizon and ADM masses (for electro-vac spacetimes) is fully justified. The reason is that, as we have seen, the change in mass of the horizon has to be equal to the total energy $\mathcal{E}$ of the in-falling object. This energy is 'measured' by the KVF ξ, and then its natural extension to the horizon is the now null vector $\ell = \xi$. Any other choice of vector ℓ of the type $\alpha\xi$, when extended to the horizon will give different values of the surface gravity κ_ℓ and therefore, of the measure of energy falling into the black hole, and of its horizon mass. One possibility is that one takes, for instance, the vector $w^a = \xi/V$ that, as we have seen corresponds to the four-velocity of an observer at rest. In that case, we can not really extend it to the horizon since $V = 0$ there. What one could do is to stay a little bit outside the horizon and define the various quantities there. This is precisely the proposal we shall comment on now.

Energy by observers at rest. As we have seen, if we choose the vector w^a and try to extend it to the horizon as a generator of the horizon, we do not succeed since the redshift factor V vanishes there. A recent proposal is to consider instead an observer that is at a small distance, of the order of the Planck length, outside the horizon [4]. Next, the generalized kinetic energy is taken as the "right" notion of energy and then the authors consider a modified 1st law that reflects this observer at rest. Let us describe this procedure and offer some comments. The first step is to look at the first law and see if one can find a new $\bar\kappa$ that captures the fact that the description of the particle falling will be done by the observer at rest. The first attempt, namely to generalize the equation $\ell^a\nabla_a\ell^b = \kappa\ell^b$ (valid at the horizon) and use the acceleration g of the observer at rest given by $g = \frac{M}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that, at the horizon, the surface gravity κ satisfies $\kappa = Vg$, namely it is equal to the red-shifted value of the acceleration (that diverges on the horizon). Thus, one could propose that the "effective"' surface gravity just outside the horizon is given by,

$$\bar\kappa = \frac{\kappa}{V} = \kappa\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{20}$$

Note that this is precisely the proposal of [4]. Their argument is the following: As seen by the observer at rest, the energy that the observer assigns to the particle is $E = \mathcal{E}/V$. Thus, according to the observer, the black hole mass $\tilde M$ must have changed by E and not $\mathcal{E}$. Then

$$\delta\tilde M = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{V} = \frac{\delta M_{\rm h}}{V} \tag{21}$$

Then, using the 1st law, they conclude that $\delta\tilde M = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi V}\delta A$. Thus, the corresponding surface gravity for the observers mass $\tilde M$ is $\bar\kappa = \kappa/V$.

With this choice, there is a local sense of conservation, which means that the energy that the observer sees falling into the black hole is recovered in the mass of the black hole when it grows. However, if we decide to consider this as the notion of energy of the black hole horizon, we loose any contact with the *canonical* definition of total energy at infinity, so the energy balance that we had before with the energy $\mathcal{E}$ and the ADM energy for the whole spacetime, is lost.

V. DISCUSSION

In this note we have considered test particles on stationary spacetimes and, in particular, in the context of an asymptotically flat black hole static spacetime. As we have argued in detail, there is an important difference between the two main notions of energy. The direct generalization to general relativity, of the energy as measured by an observer, even when well defined independently of the spacetime geometry and observer, does not provide us with information about the gravitational contribution to the energy. On the other hand, when the spacetime is stationary, there is a conserved quantity that can be interpreted as the total energy of the particle, *including* the gravitational contribution. We have also isolated the gravitational potential energy for certain cases.

We have explored some of the consequences of these notions of energy for the simplest case of a Schwarzschild black hole. We considered also the different notions of energy for the black hole. For that the formalism that has proved useful is that of isolated horizons. In that case there is a preferred notion of horizon energy that is consistent with energy balance at infinity. If we use this notion of energy for the horizon, then we get a full consistent description of the energetics if we associate to the in-falling object the notion of *total* energy $\mathcal{E}$. We have also considered an alternative description where the energy associated to the particle is the one given by an observer at rest. If we modify the notion of horizon energy to retain local energy conservation, we are lead to a very different mass for the horizon that is however, not tailored to the global notion of energy at infinity. One should note that, even when we have explicitly considered only static vacuum solutions, one expects these results to be qualitatively similar on other static black hole spacetimes, including matter, and for stationary solutions.

One could also wonder what would be the situation of a test matter field as defined by a stress energy tensor T_{ab}. In this case, there is also a distinction between the SR notion of energy momentum flux as seen by an observer w^a, given by $j^a = T^a{}_b w^b$, and the *conserved* current when a KVF ξ^a is present, given by $\tilde{j}^a := T^a{}_b \xi^b$. Note that since $\nabla_a \tilde{j}^a = 0$, the integral,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rm matt} := \int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\ \sqrt{q}\ \tilde{j}^a n_a = \int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\ \sqrt{q}\ T_{ab}\,\xi^a n^b \qquad (22)$$

over a Cauchy surface Σ, is conserved. Again, the difference between the two integrands depends on the redshift factor $V = |\xi_a \xi^a|^{1/2} < 1$ that accounts for the gravitational (potential) energy. In this case, it affects the local notion of energy flux density and distinguishes it from the (non-conserved) generalization of the SR notion of energy defined by $E_{\rm matt} := \int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\ \sqrt{|q|}\ T_{ab}\, n^a n^b$. It should be noted that the conserved energy (22) is closely related to the quantity defined by Komar. If we consider the issue of matter flowing into the black hole, then the relevant quantity representing flux across the horizon will be $T_{ab}\xi^a$, and *not* the quantity $T_{ab}w^a$.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank A. Perez for helpful comments. This work was in part supported by DGAPA-UNAM IN103610 grant, by NSF PHY0854743 and by the Eberly Research Funds of Penn State.

[1] R. M. Wald, "General Relativity," Chicago, USA: Univ. Pr. (1984) 491p

[2] N. M. J. Woodhouse,"General relativity," London, UK: Springer (2007) 219 p

[3] A. Ashtekar, S. Fairhurst and B. Krishnan, "Isolated horizons: Hamiltonian evolution and the first law," Phys. Rev. D **62**, 104025 (2000) [gr-qc/0005083]; A. Ashtekar, A. Corichi and D. Sudarsky, "Hairy black holes, horizon mass and solitons," Class. Quant. Grav. **18**, 919 (2001) [gr-qc/0011081].

[4] A. Ghosh and A. Perez, "Black hole entropy and isolated horizons thermodynamics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 241301 (2011) [Erratum-ibid. **108**, 169901 (2012)] [arXiv:1107.1320 [gr-qc]]; E. Frodden, A. Ghosh and A. Perez, "A local first law for black hole thermodynamics," arXiv:1110.4055 [gr-qc].

[5] E. Bianchi, "Entropy of Non-Extremal Black Holes from Loop Gravity," arXiv:1204.5122 [gr-qc].